APPENDIX A — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT DATED APRIL 30, 2001

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

February 26, 2001
#C-69

No. 00-8078

In Re: Arthur O. Armstrong,

Petitioner

(ED of PA D.C. Civil No. 99-00825)

Present: MANSMANN, *Circuit Judge*

1. Petitioner's Request for Permission to File Federal Lawsuit;

2. Motion by Petitioner for Permission to File Federal Lawsuit and Motion for Summary Judgment;

3. Petitioner's Request for Permission to Docket Petition for Writ of Mandamus;

* * *

s/ Lynn M. Caswell
Lynn M. Caswell
Case Manager (267)299-4922

Appendix A

ORDER

The foregoing "Requests" (at 1. and 3.) and the motion (at 2.) are denied.

By the Court,

s/ Carol Los Mansmann
Circuit Judge

Dated: APR 30 2001

APPENDIX B — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT DATED APRIL 23, 2001

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

April 13, 2001
#C-86

No. 01-8012

Arthur O. Armstrong,

Petitioner

v.

Philadelphia Board of Education, et al.
(ED of PA D.C. Civil No. 94-03544)

Present: MANSMANN, *Circuit Judge*

Request by Arthur O. Armstrong to File an Appeal from the District Court Order Filed March 30, 2001.

s/ Lynn M. Caswell
Lynn M. Caswell
Case Manager (267)299-4922

Appendix B

ORDER

The foregoing "Request" is denied.

By the Court,

s/ Carol Los Mansmann
Circuit Judge

Dated: APR 23 2001

APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA DATED MARCH 29, 2001 AND FILED AND ENTERED MARCH 30, 2001

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 94-3544

ARTHUR A. ARMSTRONG

v.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA, et al.

ORDER

~~By Order of September 28, 1999, Civil Action 99-0825,~~ my colleague Judge Hutton enjoined plaintiff Armstrong from filing complaints relating in any way to his discharge on August 25, 1992, from his job with the School District of Philadelphia.

Armstrong now has submitted five or six documents which are characterized as petitions for permission to reopen and docket *Armstrong v. School Dist. of Philadelphia*, No. 94-3544. The petitions are accompanied by motions for summary judgment.

The gravamen of the petitions is that Armstrong's August 1992 dismissal by the School District violated due process

of law, the equal protection clause and the Civil Rights Act, and was caused by racial conspiracy, discrimination, harassment, a hostile work environment, and breach of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers' duty of fair representation.

These petitions and motions are barred by Judge Hutton's September, 1992 Order; accordingly, the Clerk of Court is directed not to accept them for filing.

DATE: 3/29/01

s/ TN O'Neill
THOMAS N. O'NEILL, JR., J.

APPENDIX D — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT DATED DECEMBER 21, 2000

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 00-8078

IN RE: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner

ORDER

By order entered August 14, 1997, Arthur O. Armstrong was enjoined from filing without prior authorization of the Court of Appeals, any appeal or petition for writ of mandamus/prohibition related any appeal or petition for writ of mandamus/prohibition related to his discharge as a teacher in the Philadelphia public school system, including but not limited to actions against the Philadelphia School District, the Philadelphia Board of Education and its individual members, and the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers.

On December 21, 2000, the Clerk received a petition for writ of mandamus from Mr. Armstrong related to *Armstrong v. School District of Philadelphia, et al.*, ED PA No. 99-cv-00825.

As the district court action is based on Mr. Armstrong's dismissal from his position as a teacher with the Philadelphia School District, the petition for writ of mandamus falls within this Court's injunction order.

Appendix D

Mr. Armstrong has not received permission to file this petition for writ of mandamus. Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Mr. Armstrong file a request for permission to have the petition for writ of mandamus docketed within 14 days from the date of this order. If a request is not received within the time stated the matter will be administratively closed.

It is noted that Mr. Armstrong has submitted a check in the amount of $100.00 for the filing of the petition. Insofar as the petition cannot be docketed without the express permission of the Court, the check will not be processed at this time. Rather the check shall be held by the Clerk. In the event that the Court allows the filing of the petition for writ of mandamus, the check will be processed. In the event that the Court denies permission or Mr. Armstrong does not seek permission, the check will be returned to Mr. Armstrong.

For the Court,

s/ Marcia M. Waldron
Clerk

Dated: December 21, 2000

APPENDIX E — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA DATED, FILED AND ENTERED NOVEMBER 6, 2000

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 99-0825

ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG

v.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA, et al.

ORDER

AND NOW, on this 6th day of November, 2000, upon consideration of the following:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Complaint alleging conspiracy to defraud;

2. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Complaint alleging racial discrimination;

3. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Complaint alleging legal professional malpractice;

4. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Complaint alleging wantonness and grossness;

5. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Complaint alleging equal protection clause violation; and

6. Plaintiff's Motions for Leave to File Complaint alleging breach of contract,[1]

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that said Motions **are DENIED**.[2]

BY THE COURT:

s/ Herbert J. Hutton
HERBERT J. HUTTON, J.

---

1. Plaintiff has filed two identical Motions for leave to file Complaint alleging breach of contract in this matter.

2. The Court denies Plaintiff's Motion pursuant to the Court's Order of September 29, 1999. That Order required that before Plaintiff could obtain leave of Court, Plaintiff must demonstrate that (1) the proposed filing can survive a challenge under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12; (2) that the filing is not barred by principles of claim or issue preclusion; (3) is not repetitive or violative of a court order; and (4) that it is in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. Having failed to demonstrate that he has met the requirements of this Court's Order, the Court denies the Plaintiff's Motions.